IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 2253 OF 2024

Sulabai Sopan Nevale & Ors. …. Petitioners

V/s.

Subhash Maruti Gholap Since Decd. Thr. Legal Heir & Anr. …. Respondents

----

Dr.Uday Warunjikar i/b Mr.Siddesh Pilankar, for the Petitioners.
Mr.Sudhir Sadavarte a/w Mr.Samarth Sadavarte, for Respondent No.1.
Ms.V.S. Nimbalkar, AGP, for Respondent Nos.2 and 3-State.

CORAM : R.M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 20th AUGUST 2024

P.C:-

. The short point is involved in this Petition is as to whether the impugned order can sustained, since it is unseasoned order.

2. The order impugned reads thus :-

ORDER

"Adv. B.B. Bhargude present for applicant in case No.P/VIII/4/2017 & P/X/8/2017.
Nobody present for respondent.
Revision allowed. S.D.O. order No. Ten/Apeal/14/2014, dated 01/09/2017 and order

of A.L.T. in TNC Case No. 32G/SR/36/2011, dated 11/08/2011 both set aside.
Remitted back to A.L.T. Haveli for fresh enquiry in the light of observations made in judgment."

3. In order to ascertain, this is operative part of the order the order by itself, the direction was given to place on record any such detailed order passed by the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal, Bench at Pune. No such order is shown to have been passed indicating reasons for allowing the Revision Application. The order impugned being not supported by any reason cannot sustained.

4. As a result of this, the impugned order is set aside. The proceedings bearing Revision Application No.P/X/8/2017, are relegated back to the Maharashtra Revenue Tribunal for decision a fresh. Any order passed by the Authority on the basis of order impugned shall not sustain and such orders too stand set aside.

5. The Revenue Tribunal to decide this Revision within a period of six months.

(R.M. JOSHI, J.)